arXiv:1703.05152v1 [math.PR] 15 Mar 2017

ON SOME CONJECTURES OF SAMUELS AND FEIGE

ROLAND PAULIN

Abstract. Let $\mu_1 \geq \ldots \geq \mu_n > 0$ and $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_n = 1$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent non-negative random variables with $EX_1 = \ldots = EX_n = 1$, and let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i X_i$. Let $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mu_i = \mu_1$, and let $\delta > 0$ and $T = 1 + \delta$. Both Samuels and Feige formulated conjectures bounding the probability $P(Z < T)$ from above. We prove that Samuels' conjecture implies a conjecture of Feige.

1. Introduction

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $\mu_1 \geq \ldots \geq \mu_n > 0$ and $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_n = 1$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent non-negative random variables with $EX_1 = \ldots = EX_n = 1$, and let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i X_i$. Let $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mu_i = \mu_1$, and let $\delta > 0$ and $T = 1 + \delta$.

Feige [1], [2] proves a weaker version of the following conjecture, with the constant $\frac{1}{13}$ in place of $\frac{1}{e}$.

Conjecture 1.1.

$$P(Z < T) \geq \min\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta + M}, \frac{1}{e}\right).$$

We can have equality here sometimes. If $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mu_i = \mu_1$, and $X_2 = \ldots = X_n = 1$, and $P(X_1 = \frac{\delta+M}{M}) = \frac{M}{\delta+M}$ and $P(X_1 = 0) = \frac{\delta}{\delta+M}$, then $P(Z < T) = \frac{\delta}{\delta+M}$. If $M = \mu_1 = \ldots = \mu_n = \frac{1}{n}$, and $P(X_i = n(1+\delta)) = \frac{1}{n(1+\delta)}$ and $P(X_i = 0) = 1 - \frac{1}{n(1+\delta)}$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then $P(Z < T) = (1 - \frac{1}{n(1+\delta)})^n$. Taking $n \to \infty$ shows that the conjecture is not true for any constant bigger than $\frac{1}{e}$.

Samuels [3] has a related conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2.

$$P(Z < T) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{i} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_j}{T - \sum_{k=i+1}^n \mu_k}\right).$$

Here we can have equality for all $\mu_1 \geq \ldots \geq \mu_n > 0$: Let $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let $X_j = 1$ for every $j > i$, and if $j \leq i$, then let $P(X_j = 0) = 1 - \frac{\mu_j}{T - \sum_{k=i+1}^n \mu_k}$ and $P\left(X_j = \frac{T - \sum_{k=i+1}^n \mu_k}{\mu_j}\right) = \frac{\mu_j}{T - \sum_{k=i+1}^n \mu_k}$. Then $P(Z < T) = \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - \frac{\mu_j}{T - \sum_{k=i+1}^n \mu_k})$.

The goal of this paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Conjecture 1.2 implies Conjecture 1.1.*

Date: March 16, 2017.

2. Proof of the theorem

Let

$$\Phi\colon [0,1]\times(0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R},\quad (\mu,\rho)\mapsto\begin{cases}\frac{1}{\mu}\log\left(1-\frac{\mu}{1+\rho}\right) & \text{if } \mu\in(0,1],\\ -\frac{1}{1+\rho} & \text{if } \mu=0.\end{cases}$$

During the proof we will use several lemmas related to the function Φ, these are collected together in the last section.

We assume that Conjecture 1.2 holds. Let $\sigma_i=\sum_{k=1}^{i}\mu_k$ for every $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Then

$$P(Z<T)\geq\min_{1\leq i\leq n}\prod_{j=1}^{i}\left(1-\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i+\delta}\right).$$

for every $i\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Take an i which minimizes the right hand side. Note that $\Phi\left(\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i},\frac{\delta}{\sigma_i}\right)=\frac{\sigma_i}{\mu_j}\log\left(1-\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i+\delta}\right)$ for every $j\in\{1,\dots,i\}$. So

$$\log P(Z<1+\delta)\geq\sum_{j=1}^{i}\log\left(1-\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i+\delta}\right)=\sum_{j=1}^{i}\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i}\Phi\left(\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i},\frac{\delta}{\sigma_i}\right).$$

Since $\sum_{j=1}^{i}\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i}=1$, and $\Phi\left(\frac{\mu_j}{\sigma_i},\frac{\delta}{\sigma_i}\right)\geq\Phi\left(\frac{M}{\sigma_i},\frac{\delta}{\sigma_i}\right)$ by Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$\log P(Z<1+\delta)\geq\Phi\left(\frac{M}{\sigma_i},\frac{\delta}{\sigma_i}\right).$$

We have $M=\mu_1\leq\sigma_i\leq\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mu_j=1$, so $\frac{M}{\sigma_i}\in[M,1]$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\log P(Z<1+\delta)&\geq\min_{\sigma\in[M,1]}\Phi\left(\frac{M}{\sigma},\frac{\delta}{\sigma}\right)=\min_{t\in[M,1]}\Phi\left(t,\frac{\delta}{M}t\right)\\&=\min\left(\Phi\left(1,\frac{\delta}{M}\right),\Phi(M,\delta)\right)\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.4. So

$$P(Z<1+\delta)\geq\min\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta+M},\left(1-\frac{M}{1+\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{M}}\right)\geq\min\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta+M},\frac{1}{e}\right),$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.3. So Conjecture 1.2 indeed implies Conjecture 1.1.

3. A few lemmas related to the function Φ

The following simple inequality will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.1. *If $t\in[0,1]$, then $1-\frac{t}{1+\frac{t}{e-1}}\geq e^{-t}$.*

Proof. We need to show $1-e^{-t}\geq\frac{t}{1+\frac{t}{e-1}}$, or equivalently $(1+\frac{t}{e-1})(1-e^{-t})\geq t$. Let $f\colon\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, $t\mapsto(1+\frac{t}{e-1})(1-e^{-t})-t$. Then f is a smooth function, $f(0)=0$, $f'(t)=\frac{1}{e-1}e^{-t}((e-2)(1-e^{t})+t)$ and $f''(t)=\frac{1}{e-1}e^{-t}(3-e-t)$. So f is convex in the interval $[0,3-e]$, and concave in the interval $[3-e,1]$. Moreover $f'(0)=0$, so f is monotone increasing in the interval $[0,3-e]$, hence $f(t)\geq f(0)=0$ for $t\in[0,3-e]$, so in particular $f(3-e)\geq 0$. Since f is concave in the interval

$[3-e,1]$, and $f(3-e)\geq 0$ and $f(1)=0$, we get that $f(t)\geq 0$ for every $t\in[3-e,1]$. So indeed $f(t)\geq 0$ for every $t\in[0,1]$. □

The following lemma states that Φ is strictly decreasing in its first variable.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\rho\in(0,\infty)$, $\lambda,\mu\in[0,1]$ and $\lambda<\mu$, then $\Phi(\mu,\rho)<\Phi(\lambda,\rho)$.*

Proof. Let

$$\varphi\colon[0,1)\to\mathbb{R},\quad s\mapsto-\sum_{k\geq 0}\frac{s^k}{k+1}=\begin{cases}\frac{\log(1-s)}{s} & \text{if } s\in(0,1)\\ -1 & \text{if } s=0.\end{cases}$$

The series expansion clearly shows that φ is strictly decreasing in $[0,1)$. Thus

$$\Phi(\mu,\rho)=\frac{1}{1+\rho}\varphi\left(\frac{\mu}{1+\rho}\right)<\frac{1}{1+\rho}\varphi\left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\rho}\right)=\Phi(\lambda,\rho).$$

□

The following lemma gives a lower bound for Φ, which is used at end of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mu\in[0,1]$ and $\rho\in(0,\infty)$, then*

$$\Phi(\mu,\rho)\geq\log\left(\min\left(\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho},\frac{1}{e}\right)\right).$$

Proof. If $\mu=0$, then $\Phi(\mu,\rho)=-\frac{1}{1+\rho}>-1=\log\frac{1}{e}$. If $\mu=1$, then $\Phi(\mu,\rho)=\log\frac{\rho}{1+\rho}=\log\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho}$. Now fix a $\mu\in(0,1)$. Note that Φ is smooth in $(0,1)\times(0,\infty)$. Let $\partial_1\Phi$ and $\partial_2\Phi$ denote the partial derivatives of Φ with respect to the first and second variable. We have $(\partial_2\Phi)(\mu,\rho)=\frac{1}{(1+\rho)(1+\rho-\mu)}>0$.

First suppose that $\rho\in[\frac{\mu}{e-1},\infty)$. Then $\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho}\geq\frac{1}{e}$, so we need to show that $\Phi(\mu,\rho)\geq-1$. Since $\rho\mapsto\Phi(\mu,\rho)$ is monotone increasing in $[\frac{\mu}{e-1},\infty)$, we have $\Phi(\mu,\rho)\geq\Phi(\mu,\frac{\mu}{e-1})=\frac{1}{\mu}\log\left(1-\frac{\mu}{1+\frac{\mu}{e-1}}\right)\geq-1$ by Lemma 3.1.

Now suppose that $\rho\in(0,\frac{\mu}{e-1}]$. Then $\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho}\leq\frac{1}{e}$, so we need to show that $\Phi(\mu,\rho)\geq\log\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho}$. Let $g\colon(0,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$, $\rho\mapsto\Phi(\mu,\rho)-\log\frac{\rho}{\mu+\rho}$. Then $g'(\rho)=-\frac{(1-\mu)((1+\rho)\mu-\rho^2)}{\rho(1+\rho)(1+\rho-\mu)(\mu+\rho)}$. We have $\rho\leq\frac{\mu}{e-1}<\mu$, so $(1+\rho)\mu-\rho^2>(1+\rho)\rho-\rho^2=\rho>0$, hence $g'(\rho)<0$ for every $\rho\in(0,\frac{\mu}{e-1}]$. So $g(\rho)\geq g(\frac{\mu}{e-1})=\Phi(\mu,\frac{\mu}{e-1})+1\geq 0$ by the previous paragraph. □

The following lemma states a property of the function Φ which is essential for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.4. *If $\alpha\in(0,\infty)$, then $h_\alpha\colon[0,1]\to\mathbb{R}$, $t\mapsto\Phi(t,\alpha t)$ is a concave function.*

Proof. The continuity of Φ in $[0,1]\times(0,\infty)$, and the smoothness of Φ in $(0,1)\times(0,\infty)$ implies the continuity of h_α in $[0,1]$, and the smoothness of h_α in $(0,1)$. So it is enough to prove that $h_\alpha''(t)\leq 0$ for every $t\in(0,1)$. Let $t\in(0,1)$, then $h_\alpha(t)=\frac{1}{t}\log\left(1-\frac{t}{1+\alpha t}\right)$. One can check that

$$\eta(t):=t^3h_\alpha''(t)=\frac{t(2+(6\alpha-3)t+4(\alpha^2-\alpha)t^2)}{(1-t+\alpha t)^2(1+\alpha t)^2}+2\log\left(1-\frac{t}{1+\alpha t}\right).$$

It is enough to show that $\eta(t) < 0$ for every $t \in (0,1)$. Taking the derivative, we obtain

$$\eta'(t) = -\frac{t^2(1+3(1-2\alpha+2(\alpha-\alpha^2)t)^2)}{2(1-t+\alpha t)^3(1+\alpha t)^3}.$$

Clearly $\eta'(t) < 0$. So η is strictly decreasing in the interval $(0,1)$, hence $\eta(t) < \lim_{s\to 0}\eta(s) = 0$ for every $t \in (0,1)$. □

References

[1] U. Feige, On sums of independent random variables with unbounded variance, and estimating the average degree in a graph, STOC '04: Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (2004), 594–603, http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1007352.1007443

[2] U. Feige, On sums of independent random variables with unbounded variance, and estimating the average degree in a graph, preprint (2005), http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~feige/Others/newmarkov.pdf

[3] S. M. Samuels, On a Chebyshev-type inequality for sums of independent random variables, *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **37** (1966), 248–259.

Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik, Vivatsgasse 7, D-53111, Bonn, Germany
E-mail address: paulinroland@gmail.com